



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/377,286	08/18/1999	BRAD D RUMSEY	MICT-0050-US	7573

7590 01/26/2005

TROP PRUNER HU & MILES PC  
8554 KATY FREEWAY SUITE 100  
HOUSTON, TX 77024

EXAMINER

NORRIS, JEREMY C

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2841

DATE MAILED: 01/26/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

Commissioner for Patents  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

**BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS  
AND INTERFERENCES**

Application Number: 09/377,286  
Filing Date: August 18, 1999  
Appellant(s): RUMSEY, BRAD D

**MAILED**  
JAN 25 2005  
**GROUP 2800**

---

Timothy Trop  
For Appellant

**EXAMINER'S ANSWER**

This is in response to the appeal brief filed 1/2/02.

Art Unit: \*\*\*

**(1) *Real Party in Interest***

A statement identifying the real party in interest is contained in the brief.

**(2) *Related Appeals and Interferences***

A statement identifying the related appeals and interferences that will directly affect or be directly affected by or have a bearing on the decision in the pending appeal is contained in the brief.

**(3) *Status of Claims***

The status of the claims is as follows:

Claims 1-8 and 10-30 are pending.

Claims 7-8, 13, 15, 17-18 and 20-30 are withdrawn from consideration as not directed to the elected invention of Group I, species A, identified in paper #4.

**(4) *Status of Amendments After Final***

The appellant's statement of the status of amendments after final rejection contained in the brief is correct.

**(5) *Summary of Invention***

The summary of invention contained in the brief is correct.

**(6) *Issues***

The appellant's statement of the issues in the brief is correct.

**(7) *Grouping of Claims***

Appellant's brief includes a statement that claims 1, 3, 10 and 14 do not stand or fall together and provides reasons as set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(c)(7) and (c)(8).

**(8) *Claims Appealed***

Art Unit: \*\*\*

The copy of the appealed claims contained in the Appendix to the brief is correct.

**(9) Prior Art of Record**

3537176

Healy et al.

11-1970

**(10) Grounds of Rejection**

The following ground(s) of rejection are applicable to the appealed claims:

35 USC 102 includes the following sections which state:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-6, 10-12, 14, 16 and 19 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Healy et al. (US 3537176, hereafter Healy).

Claims 1-4, 9-12 and 19 are clearly anticipated by figure 1 of Healy.

Claims 5-6 and 14 are clearly anticipated by figure 2 of Healy.

Claim 16: The forces applied to the ball and emulation of the trace all arise (as disclosed by the specification) from the structure of the stub in conjunction with the trace. As this structure is identically disclosed by Healy, the function of claim 16 must be inherent to the device of Healy.

**(11) Response to Argument**

Appellant's argument with respect to claim 1 is that Healy does not anticipate this claim because Healy does not apply an attractive force to the solder placed on the

Art Unit: \*\*\*

interconnection pad. Appellant argues that Healy does not apply an attractive force because Healy does not show an exposed trace.

Healy shows in figure 1, which is a fragmentary view of the insulating printed circuit trace after a solder bead has been applied to it, that portions of the trace and the stub are exposed. Figures 2-3 also show an area around the bead that is void of insulating material (2) that renders that area exposed. Therefore, this feature is indeed shown by Healy.

More importantly, however, claim 1 states that the assembly includes a pad, a trace that applies an attractive force and is coupled to the pad and extending away from it and a trace stub. Claim 1 does not state that the trace is exposed. The attractive force of the trace on the solder is created by the trace being coupled to and extending away from the pad. This is the structure that supports the function of providing an attractive force which the specification sets forth and which is recited in the claims.

Further, in the first office action (paper #5), examiner raised a rejection under section 112, paragraph 2, on claim 16 (which at that time recited the function of providing an attractive force) because it was not clear whether that attractive force applied by the trace resulted from the configuration of the trace coupled to the pad, as recited in claim 1, or whether some other feature was required to provide this attractive force. Examiner stated in the rejection that if some other feature was required, then the claim was incomplete. In response to this rejection (paper #6, amendment A), *appellant amended claim 16 to recite: "the attractive force applied by the trace to said solder*

Art Unit: \*\*\*

*arises from the trace being coupled to and extending away from said bond pad.” Page 2, last paragraph, of the remarks corresponding to that amendment state: “[c]laim 16 has been amended to clarify that the function follows from the claimed structure of the trace and trace stub.”* Therefore, as the “claimed structure” includes absolutely no recitation of exposure, appellant has stated that attractive force is applied by the trace being coupled to the pad. As Healy undisputedly shows this feature, the claim is properly anticipated by Healy.

Appellant's other explanations why the trace of Healy is not exposed are not found persuasive. Appellant asserts that, if the area of figure 2 is superimposed on figure 1, it is clear that the trace is not exposed. This is not persuasive because the drawings are not to scale and figures 1 and 2 are different perspectives. Further, figure 2 and 3 show the void around the solder bead (3), figure 1 clearly shows exposed portions and figure 4 of Healy shows exposed portions. Furthermore, one of ordinary skill in the art, would have construed the void illustrated by Healy as defining an exposed pad and exposed portions of the trace and stub as shown in figures 1 and 4.

With respect to claim 3, appellant argues that Healy does not show a non-solder mask defining pad because the pad is defined by the surrounding insulation. Again, as stated above, examiner believes that Healy shows a void around the pad and the traces that defines an exposed pad. Therefore, this argument is the same as that with respect to claim 1 that alleges that the insulation (2) does not expose any part of the trace (1). For the reasons stated above, examiner believes that Healy shows the pad and its perimeter exposed. Therefore, the pad is non-solder mask defined.

Art Unit: \*\*\*

More importantly, as clearly seen from figure 1, the pad is defined by the enlarged metallic portion (4). *Even if no insulation existed, this pad would be defined by the perimeter of the circle shown at (4) in figure 1.* Therefore, irrespective of the location of the insulation, the pad is defined by the perimeter of the metallic area of (4) and not by any thing else. This is another reason why the pad is a non-solder mask defined pad.

Appellant argues with respect to claim 10 that Healy does not show an element that counteracts the attractive force of the trace on the solder. As clearly seen in the figures of Healy, the element is the stub trace that is diametrically opposed to trace (1). This is precisely the same element that appellant sets forth in his specification which counteracts the attractive force of the trace. Therefore, this element is also shown in Healy.

Appellant again argues that the solder deposition region is only as large as the pad. By this statement, appellant is saying that the insulation (2) of Healy covers all but a portion of pad (4). Therefore, there is no exposed portion of the trace or stub. Therefore, the element cannot create a force to counteract the attractive force applied by the trace. First, as stated above, examiner believes that the exposed areas as shown by Healy, and thus the functionality of providing an attractive force by the trace and the counteracting force by the stub is disclosed.

Moreover, examiner would like to point out that claim 10 recites three elements: a pad, a trace and a stub. There is absolutely *no mention of any insulation, mask, coverage or exposure in claim 10.* Therefore, the argument with respect to the

Art Unit: \*\*\*

location of the solder mask is moot because the claim does not require the presence of the masks or any other layer for that matter.

With respect to claim 14, appellant argues that the opening is not shown and, therefore, the element cannot extend through the opening. Claim 14 recites that the system of claim 10 (including a pad, a trace coupled thereto and an element adapted to counteract the attractive force) includes a solder mask defining an opening and the element extending from the pad and through the opening. The solder mask of claim 14 corresponds to the insulating material (2) of Healy (as is well known in the art) that has an opening in it as clearly shown in figures 1-3. Appellant does not dispute the mask being element (2) or the existence of the opening, but argues that the opening delimits the pad and, therefore, the sub, the element counteracting the attractive force, cannot extend through the opening. Therefore, once again appellant is arguing that there is no open area around the pad of Healy. This argument is not persuasive as discussed with respect to claims 1, 3 and 10 above and will not be repeated here.



Art Unit: \*\*\*


For the above reasons, it is believed that the rejections should be sustained.

Respectfully submitted,

Jeremy Norris  
December 20, 2004

Conferees (May 2002)  
Arthur Grimley  
David Talbott  
Kamand Cuneo

TROP PRUNER HU & MILES PC  
8554 KATY FREEWAY SUITE 100  
HOUSTON, TX 77024

  
RANDY W. GIBSON  
PRIMARY EXAMINER